WEDNESDAY, May 2, 2001
Commission Office

1. Executive Committee

EXEC-1 Approval of the February 7, 2001 Executive Committee Minutes
EXEC-2 Approval of the Commission's 2002 Meeting Schedule
EXEC-3 Review and Revision of the Commission's Policy Manual
EXEC-4 Review of Applications for the Committee of Credentials

2. General Session

The Commission will immediately convene into Closed Session
Closed Session (Vice Chairman Madkins)
(The Commission will meet in Closed Session pursuant to California Government Code Section 11126 as well as California Education Code Sections 44245 and 44248)

3. Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chair Madkins)

A&W-1 Approval of the Minutes
A&W-2 Reconsideration of Waiver Denials
A&W-3 Waivers: Consent Calendar
A&W-4 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
A&W-5 Waivers: Denial Calendar

THURSDAY, May 3, 2001
Commission Office

1. General Session (Chairman Bersin) 8:00 a.m.

   GS-1 Roll Call
   GS-2 Pledge of Allegiance
   GS-3 Approval of the April 2001 Minutes
   GS-4 Approval of the May 2001 Agenda
   GS-5 Approval of the May 2001 Consent Calendar
   GS-6 Annual Calendar of Events
   GS-7 Chair's Report
   GS-8 Executive Director's Report
   GS-9 Report on Monthly State Board Meeting

2. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Vice Chairman Madkins)

   LEG-1 Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission
   LEG-2 Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

3. Credentials and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Fortune)

   C&CA-1 Application for an Eminence Single Subject Teaching Credential
   C&CA-2 Proposed Changes to Title 5 §80026 and 80027 Pertaining to the Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators and Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permits

4. Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Boquiren)

   FPPC-1 Update on the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 2001-2002
5. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)

PREP-1 Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

PREP-2 Recommended Approval of a Contract for Improving Rural BTSA Communications

6. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Johnson)

PERF-1 Proposed Content Specifications for the Preliminary Educational Technology Test

7. Day of the Teacher and 30 Years of Excellence Celebration 11:00 a.m.

8. Reconvene General Session (Chairman Bersin)

GS-10 Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee
GS-11 Report of the Executive Committee
GS-12 Report of Closed Session Items
GS-13 Commissioners Reports
GS-14 Audience Presentations
Old Business

GS-15 • Quarterly Agenda for Information May, June and July 2001

GS-16 New Business
GS-17 Adjournment

All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only
Except Time Specific Items Identified Herein (i.e. Public Hearing)
The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice
Persons wishing to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Request Card and give it to the Recording Secretary prior to the discussion of the item.

Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability
Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing may request assistance by contacting the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

NEXT MEETING
June 6-7, 2001
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
May 2-3, 2001

LEG-1

Legislative

Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission

Dan Gonzales, Legislative Liaison
Office of Governmental Relations

BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

April 17, 2001

SPONSORED BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number -- Author -- Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 57 -- Scott -- Amended 3/12/01 Would make numerous noncontroversial, technical and clarifying changes to the Education Code. Allows pre-interns the option of taking subject matter courses to renew their certificate to advance to the intern program.</td>
<td>Sponsor -- Introduced version -- (Dec. 2000)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Appropriations. Not scheduled for hearing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number -- Author -- Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Version (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 75</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>Amended 4/2/01 Watch -- Introduced version -- (Feb 2001) Support -- 2/22/01 version -- (March 2001)</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Not scheduled for hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 272</td>
<td>Pavley</td>
<td>Introduced 2/16/01 Oppose -- Introduced version -- (March 01)</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Not scheduled for hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1232</td>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>As Introduced on 2/23/01 Seek Amendments -- Introduced version -- (March 2001)</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1307</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td>Introduced 2/23/01 Oppose, Unless Amended --</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is Governor Davis’ initiative to train California’s entire corps of principals and vice-principals in academic standards, leadership skills, and the use of management and diagnostic technology in three years. The Governor’s Budget proposes $15 million for this program.
the program based upon the same credentialing requirements and assessments in effect when they enrolled in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number -- Author -- Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1431 -- Horton -- Introduced 2/23/01</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would require school districts to provide a 3-day training program for substitute teachers before they start.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENATE BILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number -- Author -- Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 79 -- Murray -- Amended 2/27/01</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (Feb 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require the CCTC to develop a plan that addresses the disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits in low-performing schools in low-income communities. The plan is due by July 1, 2002 and includes a $32,000 appropriation from the General Fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 321 - Alarcon -- Introduced 2/20/01</td>
<td>Seek Amendments -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would allow school districts to provide a 30-day training program for teachers they hire on an emergency permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 572 -- O'Connell -- Introduced 2/22/01</td>
<td>Support, If Amended -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/25/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would provide a salary incentive of $15,000 dollars to fully qualified teachers in schools ranked in the first 2 deciles of the Academic Performance Index that have more than 15% of their teachers serving on emergency permits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 688 - O'Connell -- Introduced 2/23/01</td>
<td>Approve -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would make beginning teachers in regional occupation centers and programs eligible for BTSA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require the CCTC to issue a two-year subject matter credential after earning a baccalaureate degree and passage of CBEST and a clear credential after completion of 40 hours of preparation and professional development, if any, and passage of the teacher preparation assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would specify the documentation that a school district must provide the CCTC to justify a request for an emergency permit. This bill would also increase the state grant and district match for the pre-intern program and permit the CCTC to allow for district hardship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 900 -- Ortiz -- Amended 3/28/01</td>
<td>Support, If Amended -- 3/28/01 -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Public Safety. Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require Cal Grant T recipients to teach for at least four years in a subject area in a shortage area, or at a school that serves a large population of low-income families, has 20% or more teachers holding emergency permits, waivers or intern credentials, or is a low-performing school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised on April 13, 2001
May 2-3, 2001

LEG-2

Legislative

Analysis of Legislation of Interest to the Commission

Dan Gonzales, Legislative Liaison
Office of Governmental Relations

BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

April 17, 2001

SPONSORED BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number -- Author -- Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 57 -- Scott -- Amended 3/12/01 Would make numerous noncontroversial, technical and clarifying changes to the Education Code. Allows pre-interns the option of taking subject matter courses to renew their certificate to advance to the intern program.</td>
<td>Sponsor -- Introduced version -- (Dec. 2000)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Appropriations. Not scheduled for hearing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number -- Author -- Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Version (Date Adopted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 75</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (Feb 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 75</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>Support -- 2/22/01 version -- (March 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 272</td>
<td>Pavley</td>
<td>Oppose -- Introduced version -- (March 01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1232</td>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>Seek Amendments -- Introduced version -- (March 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1307</td>
<td>Goldberg</td>
<td>Oppose, Unless Amended --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the program based upon the same credentialing requirements and assessments in effect when they enrolled in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1431</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td>Introduced 2/23/01</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1431</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td>Introduced 2/23/01</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Assembly Committee on Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENATE BILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 79</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Amended 2/27/01</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (Feb 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 321</td>
<td>Alarcon</td>
<td>Introduced 2/20/01</td>
<td>Seek Amendments -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 572</td>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td>Introduced 2/22/01</td>
<td>Support, If Amended -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/25/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 688</td>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td>Introduced 2/23/01</td>
<td>Approve -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 792</td>
<td>Sher</td>
<td>Amended 4/5/01</td>
<td>Oppose -- Introduced version -- (March 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose -- 4/5/01 -- (April 2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 837</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Amended 3/28/01</td>
<td>Support -- Introduced version -- (March 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Suspense File.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 900</td>
<td>Ortiz</td>
<td>Amended 3/28/01</td>
<td>Support, If Amended -- 3/28/01 -- (April 2001)</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Public Safety. Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 955 -- Vasconcellos -- Introduced 2/23/01</td>
<td>Watch -- Introduced version -- (April 2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require Cal Grant T recipients to teach for at least four years in a subject area in a shortage area, or at a school that serves a large population of low-income families, has 20% or more teachers holding emergency permits, waivers or intern credentials, or is a low-performing school.</td>
<td>Senate Committee on Education. Not scheduled for hearing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised on April 13, 2001*
May 2-3, 2001

C&CA-2

Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Proposed Changes to Title 5 Sections 80026 and 80027 Pertaining to the Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators and Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit

April 17, 2001

Summary
There is a wide held perception that emergency permit and credential waiver document holders are not prepared for the classroom. However, fully credentialed teachers who do not qualify under one the Education Code assignment options often serve on emergency permits or credential waivers. The proposed changes to the Limited Assignment Emergency Permit will move fully credentialed teachers off of emergency permit and credential waiver documents to the limited assignment document. This change will provide the Commission documentation of those individuals who are fully credentialed who are teaching outside of their authorized area and will reduce the number of emergency permits and credential waivers.

Fiscal Impact
There are costs associated with regulation changes such as printing and mailing costs related to the distribution of the proposal. There would be no additional staff time needed to implement the proposed changes if approved.

Policy Issues To Be Resolved
Should the Commission change the Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Permit to allow non-tenured teachers to serve on the permit and allow employing agencies to use the Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators as the method to inform the public that a fully credentialed teacher is teaching outside of their authorized subject area?
Background
The Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Permits, first established in the early 1980’s, give local school districts flexibility in assigning their teachers. The permit allows a fully credentialed teacher to teach outside their authorized subject area for up to three years. During that time the teacher is to complete course work toward either a credential authorization or a supplementary authorization. This permit requires the consent of the teacher and approval of the local governing board.

In the 1990's changes were made to streamline the emergency permit process by requiring the employing agency to file an annual Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators with the Commission instead of an individual approval for each permit. The Declaration is an estimate of the number of emergency permits the employing agency reasonably expects to employ during the school year.

The emergency permit document is designed to allow employing agencies to assign non-credentialed teachers in the classroom after the agency has recruited for fully credentialed teachers, but is unable to locate them. The Limited Assignment process was designed for fully credentialed teachers to teach outside of their authorized area. However, it is currently more difficult for an employing agency to assign a fully credentialed teacher on a limited assignment permit than it is to assign them on an emergency permit. Placing fully credentialed teachers on emergency permits inflates the number of emergency permit holders. By making it more difficult for an employing agency to assign a teacher on a limited assignment permit little value has been placed on the individual holding a credential.

The Federal Title II reporting law requires that each state report the number of individuals serving on emergency permits, under California's current emergency permit structure. The numbers will include fully credentialed teachers. Title II reporting does not consider fully credentialed teachers teaching outside their credential subject area to be emergency permit teachers. The proposed changes to the Limited Assignment Permit will reduce the number of emergency permits and waivers that are to be reported on the Title II report.

Staff believes that the Commission will derive three benefits from the proposed changes:

- The ability to track fully credentialed teachers who are teaching outside their authorized subject area who do not qualify under one of the Education Code assignment options;
- Eliminate fully credentialed teachers serving on emergency permits and credential waivers; and
- Reduce the number of emergency permits and waivers to be reported on the Title II Report Card.

Proposed Changes to Title 5 Regulations
Section 80026(a) -- Staff is proposing adding the Limited Assignment Permits to the estimated number of certificated staff that will be employed on emergency permits on the Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators. This change is being proposed to eliminate the need for the governing board of an employing agency to approve each Limited Assignment Permit. This recommendation brings the Limited Assignment Permit into the same process as the emergency permit.

80027(a)(1) -- As mentioned above, staff is proposing that the Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators include an estimate of the number of Limited Assignment Permits an employing agency reasonably expects to employ during a school year. This process will eliminate the need for the governing board to approve each Limited Assignment Permit as the regulation currently stands.

80027(a)(2) -- Staff is proposing eliminating the need for the applicant to have permanent status, since this has proved to be a barrier to employing agencies using the limited assignment permit.

80027(a)(3) -- As mentioned above, staff is recommending the elimination of the need for the governing board to approved each Limited Assignment Permit.

80027(a)(4) -- Under 80028(a)(2) staff proposed eliminating the need for an applicant to hold permanent status, however, staff believes that a new teacher who is assigned outside of his or her subject area needs additional subject matter support from an experienced subject matter teacher.
Under current regulations there is no restriction on the subject that may be placed on the limited assignment document. In July 2000, Title 5 Section 80005(a) became effective and listed the types of subjects one could teach under the subject areas listed in Education Code Section 44257. This list clarifies the subject areas that can be taught and, therefore, supports the need to use the list of statutory subject areas.

Credentialed teachers are authorized to teach only the subjects listed on their credential. To teach outside of the credential area a teacher needs to consent to the assignment. Staff is proposing that the consent form be on file at the employing agency rather than at the Commission.

As stated above, a Declaration of Need is to be on file at the Commission for both the initial issuance and the renewal of the Limited Assignment Permit.

Credentialed teachers are authorized to teach only the subjects listed on their credential. To teach outside of the credential area a teacher needs to consent to the assignment. Staff is proposing that the consent form be on file at the employing agency rather than at the Commission.

These changes are being proposed to clarify that the authorization of the Limited Assignment Permit is the same as the credential.

The following pages include the changes recommended by staff to be made to existing Title 5 regulations that govern emergency permits.

§80026 Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators

Submission of a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators by the employing agency shall be a prerequisite to the issuance of any emergency permit and/or limited assignment permit for that agency. Charter schools as defined in Education Code Section 47600 shall be exempt from submitting a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators. The Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators by an employing agency shall be valid for no more than twelve months, and shall expire on the June 30 following its submission to the Commission, unless the employing agency has an approved Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators which specifies a period of validity longer than twelve months. The Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators shall be submitted to the Commission on a form to be provided by the Commission, and shall include all of the following information:

(a) Estimated Need: This shall include the title(s) and number of each type of emergency permit and limited assignment permit which the employing agency estimates, based on previous year actual needs and projections of enrollment, it will need during the year covered by the Declaration. In addition, it shall include each subject to be listed on Emergency Single Subject and Emergency Limited Assignment Single Subject Teaching Permits and the target language on Emergency Multiple Subject or Single Subject Teaching Permits with a Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Emphasis or on Emergency BCLAD Permits. The Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators shall be revised, when the number of emergency permits and limited assignment permits needed exceeds the estimate by ten percent, by the governing board or superintendent/administrator of the employing agency, as specified in subsection (e) below.

(b) Efforts to Recruit Certified Personnel. This shall include a brief description of efforts that the employing agency has undertaken to locate and recruit individuals who hold the needed credentials, such as dated copies of written announcements of its vacancy or vacancies which were mailed to college or university placement centers.

(c) Efforts to Establish Alternative Training Options. The Declaration shall:

(1) identify the names of institutions of higher education co-sponsoring internships or other certification programs with the employing agency or, if no such programs exist, briefly explain why;

(2) if the employing agency participates in pre-internship or internship programs, estimate the number which the employing agency reasonably expects to employ during the year covered by the Declaration; and

(3) indicate whether the employing agency has considered developing a "Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators" in cooperation with other education agencies in
(d) Stipulation of Insufficiency of Suitable Applicants. The employing agency shall certify that there is an insufficient number of certificated persons who meet the employing agency’s specified employment criteria to fill necessary positions.

(e) Adoption of the Declaration. The Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators shall be adopted by the governing board of a school district, or by the superintendent of a county office of education or by the administrator of a state school or nonpublic, nonsectarian school or agency.

(1) A Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators by a school district shall be adopted by the governing board in a regularly-scheduled, public meeting of the board. The entire Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators shall be included in the board agenda, and shall not be adopted by the board as part of a consent calendar.

(2) A superintendent of a county office or the administrator of a state school or nonpublic, nonsectarian school or agency shall publicly announce his or her intent to adopt a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators at least 72 hours prior to adopting the Statement. The adopted Statement shall be signed by the superintendent or administrator.

NOTE

Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225, subdivisions (d) and (g), and 44300, Education Code.

§80027. Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit.

(a) Requirements for the initial issuance of a Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit include all of the following:

(1) The employing agency must submit a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators that satisfies the provisions of Section 80026.

(1) Applicant is currently employed by the local governing board requesting such assignment and has obtained permanent status as defined in Education Code Section 44929.21 or 44929.22 or 44929.23 in a school district in California within the previous ten years.

(2) Applicant holds a valid California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a professional preparation program, including student teaching or the equivalent.

(3) The application is accompanied by the appropriate Commission-approved Employment Statement (form CL-542, rev. 5/98) signed by the applicant and an appropriate employing agency official verifying consent of both parties; describing briefly the whole assignment which the emergency permit holder would teach; explaining the situation or circumstances that necessitate the use of an emergency permit holder; stating that either a credentialed person is not available, or that one or more credentialed persons are available, but do not meet the specified employment criteria established for that position by the employing agency; and verifying prior approval of the assignment by the local governing board.

(4) Applicants who have not obtained permanent status as defined in Education Code 44929.21 or 44929.22 or 44929.23 shall be assigned an experienced educator by the employing agency in the subject area of the Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit who has completed 3 years of full-time classroom teaching experience in that subject area.

(5) The Limited Assignment Emergency Single Subject Teaching Permit may be issued in the subject areas listed in Education Code Section 44257.

(6) The employing agency must keep on file a written statement verifying consent of the teacher to serve on the Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit.

(4) The applicant submits a completed Application for Credential Authorizing Public
b) Requirements for the renewal of a Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit.

(1) Applicant is currently employed by the local governing board requesting such assignment.

(2) Applicant holds a valid California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a professional preparation program, including student teaching or the equivalent.

(3) An application for the renewal of a Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit shall be submitted to the Commission by the employing agency, and shall include all of the following.

(A) A completed Application for Credential Authorizing Public School Service (form 41-4, rev. 5/98 8/00).

(B) Payment of the fee(s) required by Section 80487.

(C) Verification of the completion of at least six semester units, or the equivalent quarter units, of course work required for issuance of the related credential.

(D) Completed Employment Statement (form CL-542, rev. 5/98) The employing agency must submit a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators that satisfies the provisions of Section 80026.

(4)(5) Validation of Professional Development Statement. The holder of a Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit who has previously taught three or more years on a credential other than an emergency credential or permit may submit the following in lieu of the required 6 semester units:

(A) Verification that he or she has completed ninety hours of professional development activities that are directly related to the subject or class authorized by the Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit; and

(B) Submission of a Validation of Professional Development Statement, signed by the employing agency and the permit holder, that includes a brief description of the content of the teacher's professional development program, a brief description of the means by which the employing agency validated the quality and appropriateness of the teacher's professional development program, and a brief description of the manner in which the results of the teacher's professional development program were evaluated.

(4)(6) An individual may renew a Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit in any one specific subject only twice during his or her lifetime.

(7) The employing agency must keep on file a written statement verifying consent of the teacher to serve on the Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit.

c) Authorization: The Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Permit authorizes the holder to teach in the assignment described in the statement signed by the teacher and the appropriate employing agency official, and approved by the local governing board as required by Section 80027(a)(3).

(1) A Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple Subject Teaching Permit authorizes the same service as a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.

(2) A Limited Assignment Emergency Single Subject Teaching Permit authorizes the same service as a Single Subject Teaching Credential in the authorized field(s) listed on the permit.

d) The Limited Assignment Emergency Multiple or Single Subject Teaching--Permit shall be valid for no less than one year and expires one calendar year from the first day of the month immediately following the date of issuance.
Authority cited: Sections 44225(d), (g) and (q) and 44300, Education Code. Reference: Section 44300, Education Code.
May 2-3, 2001

FPPC-1

Fiscal Policy and Planning

Update on the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 2001-2002

Pearl Yu, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND
In March 2001, the Commission's portion of the 2001-02 Governor's Budget was considered in hearings before Assembly and Senate budget subcommittees. The Commission's budget was adopted by the Senate budget subcommittee as proposed; however, the Assembly budget subcommittee deferred action on the Commission's budget until subsequent hearings in April 2001.

SUMMARY
At the time this agenda item was prepared, the Assembly budget subcommittee has not yet taken action on the Commission's budget. As new developments occur during the budget hearing process, staff will provide Commissioners with updates regarding the status of the Commission's proposed budget as an in-folder item at the May 2001 Commission meeting.
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FPPC-2

Fiscal Policy and Planning

Proposed Fiscal Year 2001-2002 May Revision

िन

Pearl Yu, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

Department of Finance (DOF) Budget Letter 01-03 allows state agencies to submit Spring Finance Letters (SFLs) for new proposals of critical importance that have arisen since the Fall Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process. If approved by the DOF, these SFLs are then transmitted to the Legislature as requests for Budget Bill amendments.

SUMMARY

At the time this agenda item was prepared, staff has not determined if additional SFL requests would be needed. However, should such a need arise at a later time, staff will present the SFL requests to Commissioners as an in-folder item at the May 2001 Commission meeting.
BACKGROUND

As previously scheduled on the Commission's quarterly agenda calendar, staff is presenting the Commission's revenue and expenditures data through the end of the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2000-2001.

SUMMARY

The attached charts depict the Commission's revenue and expenditure balances as of March 31, 2001. The following notes provide explanations for certain key points:

Chart I -- Revenues

- All of the revenue percentages were calculated as a ratio of the actual revenue collected compared to the amounts projected in the fall of 2000.
- The revenue received and deposited in the Teacher Credential Fund for fiscal year 2000-01 is currently 4 percent over the fall 2000 projection. Credential fees received in the first half of the year are traditionally higher than those received in the second half.
- Comparing the amounts received this year to the amounts received in the same period last year, total revenue for the Teacher for the Teacher Credentials Fund is down by $1.5 million or 14 percent. This decline is attributable to (1) a reduction in the amount of fingerprint fees collected due to Livescan implementation; (2) a reduction in credential fees received from first-time applicants taking advantage of the fee-waiver program; and (3) a five dollar reduction in credential application fees effective July 1, 2000.
- Revenues collected and deposited in the Test Development and Administration Account (TDAA) include all funds actually received as of March 31, 2001. Fees for the February administration of the CLAD/BCLAD examination have not been received as of the end of March 2001; therefore, the TDAA revenue received is skewed downward by approximately 6 percent. In addition, revenue from the CBEST and RICA examinations is historically higher in the last three administrations of the fiscal year.
Chart 2 -- Expenditures

- The "Personal Services" costs expended are shown in comparison to the budgeted amounts.
- The total "Operating Expenses & Equipment" expenditures include actual expenditures plus encumbrances (expenses that the Commission has obligated itself to spend at a future date). Also, there are other anticipated expenditures that have not yet been encumbered. Therefore, the expenditure level of 63 percent is appropriate at this point in the fiscal year.
Executive Summary

California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, which the Commission administers on behalf of the Governor's Office, includes a budget item of $500,000 in 2000-2001 for the purpose of funding additional Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation in public and/or private colleges and universities. This agenda report provides background information about Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation; the funding history of Blended Program grants; the procedures used to solicit proposals for new planning grants for Blended Programs; the proposal review process, and a recommendation for four new planning grant awards for the development of Blended Programs to be funded under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission

Should the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award four new planning grants for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs for funding the new planning grant awards for Blended Programs would be paid entirely from the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant funds.

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award planning grants for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation to the four institutions identified in the attached report.

I. Background

During the early Spring of 1998, Commission staff solicited the participation of a select group of teachers, teacher educators and subject matter experts to develop a set of Interim Standards that would guide colleges and universities in the development of blended programs of subject matter and professional preparation. The Task Force, which included representatives from the University of California, the California State University, private and independent colleges, and public schools, responded to several written drafts and met at the end of June to develop the nine standards that were ultimately adopted by the Commission in August 1998. These Interim Standards are provided for reference below. The Interim Standards have been reviewed by the SB 2042 Advisory Panel and the Elementary Subject Matter Panel, and revisions will be submitted for Commission consideration when all of the proposed teacher preparation standards are submitted for adoption in 2001.

### Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

**Interim Standard 1: Concurrent Curriculum.** In a *concurrent curriculum*, pedagogical studies at the four-year campus begin *while* an undergraduate candidate’s subject matter studies are taking place. The candidate earns academic credit toward the baccalaureate degree by completing selected pedagogical courses during the undergraduate years. Beginning as early as the candidate’s first year in the program, s/he completes selected education courses concurrently with related subject matter courses, or courses that blend subject matter and pedagogy.

**Interim Standard 2: Connected Curriculum.** In the delivery of a connected curriculum, institutional faculty draw intellectual connections between (a) the major themes (concepts, principles, and ways of knowing) of discipline-based and inter-disciplinary studies and (b) key ideas about education, teaching, and learning. Faculty guide undergraduate candidates to think pedagogically about major themes in selected subject matter courses. In the program, candidates observe and reflect on how content is taught in selected K-12 schools. Overall, the connected curriculum is designed and implemented as a means of expanding and extending candidates’ content and pedagogical knowledge and understanding.

**Interim Standard 3: Rigorous Curriculum.** In the course of connecting subject matter and pedagogical studies, and in making them concurrent, the blended curriculum for undergraduate candidates maintains the quality, depth, scope and rigor of these two domains of teacher education.

**Interim Standard 4: Collaboration in Curriculum Development.** Faculty members from education and subject matter areas collaborate, as appropriate, to develop the content and instructional methods of the courses. The institution provides adequate time and resources to facilitate effective collaboration for developing program curriculum and courses.

**Interim Standard 5: Developmental Quality.** The blended program’s coursework and field experiences are organized to reflect the developmental nature of learning-to-teach. The *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* are utilized throughout the program as a means to promote early deciders’ dialogue and self-assessment regarding their preparation as prospective teachers.

**Interim Standard 6: Early Advisement.** The institution and its multiple academic units provide opportunities for undergraduate students to learn about routes to teaching and to identify themselves as possible candidates. The institution and its academic units provide accurate, comprehensive information that enables early deciders to pass required credential examinations and pursue required and elective coursework leading to degrees and credentials without unnecessary delays or duplications. The four-year institution works jointly with selected community colleges in providing this information to pre-transfer students, and in identifying lower division courses that automatically earn transfer credits.

**Interim Standard 7: Guided Early Career Exploration.** The institution offers early career exploration activities that enable undergraduate students to make valid career decisions on
the basis of current, first-hand information about the qualities and characteristics of teaching careers in California's K-12 schools. With appropriate support by the institution, undergraduate candidates pursue carefully planned and guided early field experiences in selected school settings where they meet teachers, observe their work, become acquainted with school-based resources that teachers use, and discuss and reflect on their observations and experiences. Field-based activities that satisfy existing standards for subject matter programs and professional preparation programs may fully satisfy this standard.

**Interim Standard 8: Intra-Institutional Collaboration.** Overall design and implementation of the program include communication, consultation and shared decision-making among the academic units that contribute to undergraduate teacher education. Specific responsibilities in the program, including program coordination and candidate advisement, are clearly assigned to specific academic units or officers at the institution. The institution provides adequate time and resources to facilitate effective program coordination, candidate advisement, faculty development, collaborative practices, and shared decision-making.

**Interim Standard 9: Inter-Institutional Collaboration.** Credential programs for undergraduate candidates include the active involvement of classroom teachers and school administrators who are responsible for the education of K-12 students. The involvement of K-12 educators encompasses multiple aspects of undergraduate teacher preparation including curriculum development and implementation, candidate recruitment and selection policies and the placement and supervision of student teachers and early field participants.

The Commission's 1998-99 budget included $350,000 to provide grants to public colleges and universities seeking to develop blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. The list below indicates the institutions that received grant funding from the Commission during 1998-99:

- California State University, Dominguez Hills
- California State University, Long Beach
- California State University, Bakersfield
- Sonoma State University
- University of California, Davis
- California State University, Sacramento
- California State University, Stanislaus

**II. Planning Grants under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant**

**Introduction.** As part of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, funds were allocated for a grant process to expand this initial effort to develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. The guidelines for the Title II planning grant application process remained essentially the same as before, except that the application process was extended to both public and private institutions of higher education. Below are the guidelines relating to the issuance of grants to postsecondary institutions to develop programs that blend subject matter and professional preparation programs for prospective teachers:

1. Funds granted to institutions through this program must be used to support the development of blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. Only institutions with approved subject matter and accredited teacher education programs may participate in this program.

2. Grants should be used to support faculty release time to develop programs that meet all nine of the Commission's Interim Standards for Blended Programs. Participating institutions will have up to twelve months from the award of the grant to submit a proposed program to the Committee on Accreditation for initial accreditation.

3. Institutions should use funds granted under this program to blend professional preparation programs with either existing liberal studies programs for multiple subject credential candidates, or existing single subject programs for single subject credential candidates.

4. Campuses may apply for up to $50,000 under this program to cover the costs of release time for faculty from Colleges/Schools of Arts and Sciences and Colleges/Schools of Education to collaborate in the development of a program that
5. Institutions that previously received funding from the Commission to develop a Blended Program are not eligible to apply for funding under the Title II grant process, even for a different credential area.

Grants Funded under Title II, 1999-2000

An RFP under Title II was issued on February 5, 2000 for public and private institutions with teacher preparation programs interested in planning a Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. A review panel comprised of experts in the field from colleges and universities as well as several Commission staff met initially to review these proposals on April 6, 2000. Readers participated in a training process that included a review of the RFP, a review of the proposal evaluation criteria, and several calibration exercises applying the criteria in common to proposal samples. Readers were paired off and assigned three proposals each to read and score over the course of the next week. Recommendations were subsequently made to the Commission and approved to fund eleven proposals, from the institutions listed below:

- St. Mary's College (Multiple subjects, CLAD and BCLAD)
- San Diego State University (Multiple subjects, CLAD and BCLAD)
- California Polytechnic State University, Pomona (Multiple subjects, CLAD)
- California State University, Northridge (Single subject, English and Mathematics)
- Dominican College (Multiple subjects, CLAD)
- San Jose State University (Multiple subjects, CLAD)
- California State University, Los Angeles (Single subject, Science)
- Humboldt State University (Multiple subjects, CLAD)
- California State University, San Bernardino (Multiple subjects, CLAD)
- Stanford University (Single subject, English)
- California State University, Riverside

Below are the scoring criteria the readers applied to each grant application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Score: Each Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Credential Type(s) and Number of Participants. The proposal provides a strong rationale for offering particular credential type(s) in the program. The plan targets school subject(s) and credential specialty(ies) in which teacher shortages occur in local area schools (K-12). The proposal provides a credible basis for anticipating comparatively large numbers of enrolled students during the first three years of the program's availability.</td>
<td>3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Support and Articulation. The proposal offers a credible prospect that candidates will be supported and retained as they move through the program. Articulation agreements with local community colleges are a credible part of the plan to provide a potentially seamless preparation program for transfer candidates.</td>
<td>7 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) School Placements. Candidates are likely to be placed with teachers who will provide relatively strong models for candidates, in schools with comparatively high need for qualified teachers, including (but not limited to) schools with teacher shortages.</td>
<td>5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Subjects of Anticipated Blending. Within each credential type to be offered to candidates in the program, the proposal offers a credible prospect that subject matter and professional preparation will be blended in multiple significant subject areas that have been selected by the institution.</td>
<td>8 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5) Institutional Readiness for a Blended Program. The proposal provides strong evidence that the requested grant would yield relatively significant "gains" in terms of the institution's capacity to plan, develop and offer a program that will meet all of the *Interim Standards for Blended Programs*.

10 Points

(6) Program Planning Leadership and Participation. Leadership roles as well as planning and development duties would be assigned to individuals who are well-qualified for the roles/duties.

9 Points

(7) Program Planning Organizational Chart. The plan for program development is clear and well-organized with sound responsibilities and clear lines of accountability.

10 Points

(8) Intramural Collaboration. The plan for intramural collaboration is sound, and includes appropriate roles and responsibilities for each intramural participant.

10 Points

(9) Extramural Collaboration. The plan for extramural collaboration with K-12 practitioners and community college representatives is sound, and will draw on the expertise of personnel in the schools/colleges most affected by the program.

10 Points

(10) Institutional Commitment. The proposal includes credible evidence of comparatively broad and high levels of administrative, fiscal and faculty support and commitment by the participating intramural units and extramural partners.

10 Points

(11) Program Planning Timeframe. The proposal includes a credible timeframe that promises to yield a strong program plan that will be submitted on or before March 1, 2001 for accreditation on the basis of the nine *Interim Standards*.

8 Points

(12) Program Planning Budget. The proposal includes a complete budget. The sponsors would add to the effectiveness of the Commission’s grant with appropriate contributions from local (institutional) resources and other (federal, private, etc.) sources.

10 Points

**Total Possible Score for a Grant Award Proposal**

100 Points

---

**RFP Process for 2000-2001**

Title II funding included $500,000 to continue support for the development of blended programs. In February, 2001, another RFP was sent to the field inviting applications for a Blended Program planning grant, with the same directions and criteria as were used during the 1999-2000 grant process. A total of four Blended Program grant applications were received.

An expert panel was assembled at the Commission's offices on April 17, 2001, to read and review the grant applications, using the process and criteria described above.

The following institutions are recommended to receive Blended Program planning grants:

- California State University, Chico, Single Subject Physical Education
- California Lutheran University, Multiple Subject/CLAD
- California State University, Monterey Bay, Multiple Subject B/CLAD and Mild/Moderate Special Education
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Recommended Approval of a Contract for Improving Rural BTSA Communications

Professional Services Division
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Executive Summary

California’s Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, which the Commission administers on behalf of the Governor’s Office, is used to support all aspects of the Learning to Teach Continuum. In 1999-2000, excess funds from the USDOE were offered to existing Title II projects as supplementary funding for additional activities that would serve to enhance teacher quality efforts. California requested to use the supplementary support funds in the amount of $152,202 to improve the support of Beginning Teachers in rural areas by implementing a project that would use technological advances in communication to enhance the supportive relationship between Beginning Teachers in rural areas and their Support Providers, who were often located at a distance from them. In awarding this contract, the Commission would support a pilot improved communications project between Beginning Teachers in a county with large rural areas, Imperial County, and their Support Providers in San Diego County.

Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission

Should the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award this contract for $152,202 under Title II to improve rural BTSA communications?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs for funding the contract for improving rural BTSA communications would be paid...
entirely from the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant funds.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award this contract for improving rural BTSA communications to the county office of education identified in the attached report.

I. Background

The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program maintains a strong, supportive relationship between the Beginning Teacher and the Support Provider.

When excess funds became available from USDOE for use in the State's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant in 1999-2000, Professional Teacher Preparation and Professional Teacher Induction programs that were already being funded through that grant were asked to apply for supplementary funding for projects that would improve the quality of their programs. San Diego County Office of Education applied for supplementary funding in the amount of $152,202 for a project that would assist Beginning Teachers in rural areas of Imperial County to work closely with their Support Providers who were often at a great geographical distance from them. Because close person-to-person communication is so crucial to the successful implementation of the supportive work that is integral to BTSA projects, this pilot project offered the best opportunity to enhance the work that was being done in an existing project.

II. Purpose of the Contract

The purpose of the contract is to pilot an improved communication system between Beginning Teachers and Support Providers in rural Imperial and San Diego Counties. Within the scope of the contract, San Diego County Office of Education will be expected to identify Support Providers, develop and implement improved technology-based communication links so that Beginning Teachers and their Support Providers can establish face to face communication through improved video conferencing technology, develop and provide training as necessary in technology-based communication links, and plan and carry out an evaluation of the effectiveness of the improved technology-based distance communication system.

III. Recommendation

Staff recommends that the contract award to San Diego County Office of Education in the amount of $152,202 for improving rural BTSA program communications be approved.
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Proposed Content Specifications for the Preliminary Educational Technology Test

Professional Services Division

April 17, 2001

Executive Summary

In December of 1998, the Commission adopted the Technology Standard for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential candidates. The purpose of this agenda report is to describe the progress that has been made on the development of a new assessment to meet the Level I proficiencies of the Technology Standard and to request adoption of the content specifications for the new test, to be known as the Preliminary Educational Technology Test.

Fiscal Impact Summary

National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) is developing the Preliminary Educational Technology Test as part of the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching® (SSAT) series at no additional cost to the Commission.

Policy Issue To Be Decided

What knowledge and skills should be eligible for assessment on the Preliminary Educational Technology Test?

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached content specifications for the Preliminary Educational Technology Test.
Background Information

In September 1997, AB 1023 (Mazzoni, 1997) was enacted, amending Education Code Section 44259. This amendment requires the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to establish standards of program quality and effectiveness relative to the use of computer-based technology in the classroom for preliminary credential candidates, and to establish standards of program quality and effectiveness relative to advanced computer-based technology for professional credential candidates.

At its December 1997 meeting, the Commission approved a plan for the implementation of the new provisions of AB 1023, authorizing the Executive Director to form a Computer Education Advisory Panel. The purpose of the advisory panel was to develop and recommend standards of program quality and effectiveness for the effective use of computer-based technology as required by the newly amended law.

The Executive Director selected 18 panelists from across the state of California to serve on the advisory panel. The panel included a diverse group of highly qualified individuals: school administrators, public school teachers, a library professional, mentor teachers, curriculum specialists, private sector professionals, and college and university faculty. Two liaison representatives also served on the panel, one representing the Education Council for Technology in Learning (ECTL), and the other representing the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

In December of 1998, at the recommendation of the advisory panel, the Commission adopted the Technology Standard for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential candidates (see Appendix A). The new standard requires credential candidates to 1) demonstrate effective use of technology at a "basic" level (Level I) prior to issuance of a preliminary credential; and 2) demonstrate effective use of technology at an "advanced" level (Level II) prior to issuance of a professional credential.

As required by AB 1023, the Commission must make available a Commission-approved assessment of the Level I proficiencies as an alternative to completing approved coursework. This component is intended to target those out-of-state credential candidates seeking a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential. For this reason, in the fall of 2000 the advisory panel was invited to reconvene as the Content Advisory Committee for the development of the Preliminary Educational Technology Test. Eleven of the original panel members have served as members of this new committee. A complete roster of the Content Advisory Committee is in Appendix B.

Update on the Development of the Preliminary Educational Technology Test

The Preliminary Educational Technology Test

The Preliminary Educational Technology Test will be offered as a part of the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) series administered by National Evaluation Systems (NES). This criterion-referenced test will include 100 multiple-choice items (80 scorable items and 20 non-scorable items) and two constructed-response items. Candidates will be provided up to five hours to complete the test.

Development of Draft Content Specifications

The Content Advisory Committee met in late 2000 to develop draft content specifications based on the Level I elements of the Technology Standard required of Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential candidates. The draft specifications were also reviewed by the Commission's Bias Review Committee to eliminate potential bias and ensure that the proposed content reflected the diversity of the California population.

Validation of the Draft Content Specifications

This spring, a study was conducted to evaluate the validity of the content specifications. Surveys were sent to over 200 teacher education faculty of Commission-approved teacher preparation programs for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential candidates and to more than 500 California public school teachers holding valid, non-emergency credentials that authorize instruction in any of grades K-12. Ninety-six eligible teacher educators and 151 eligible public school teachers completed the survey. Participants were asked to rate the importance of each of the draft content specifications for the effective job performance of a
beginning teacher in any of grades K-12 in California public schools. The following Likert scale was used: 1 = not important, 2 = of little importance, 3 = moderately important, 4 = important, and 5 = very important.

Data were examined for all teacher educators and public school teachers, with further analysis of the public school teacher data by ethnic/racial background, gender, and grade level of current teaching position. Overall, the survey responses were positive and supportive of the content specifications as important for the effective job performance of a beginning teacher. A summary of the survey results is presented in Table 1 on the next page. The complete set of proposed content specifications are provided in Appendix C. The survey results were reviewed by both the Bias Review Committee and the Content Advisory Committee.

Table 1: Mean Importance Ratings for Teacher Educators and Public School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec. #</th>
<th>Brief Descriptor (See Appendix C for complete specifications.)</th>
<th>Teacher Educators (N=96)</th>
<th>Public School Teachers (N=151)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Computer Operations, Concepts, and Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hardware/software</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer-related hardware</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Troubleshooting for hardware</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legal and ethical issues</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Privacy, security, and safety</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Applications of Computer Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Software for managing records</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communication through printed media</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Use of e-mail for communication</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Computer-based collaborative tools</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Electronic research tools</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Authentic/reliable/unbiased sources</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Applications of Computer Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Appropriate use in teaching/learning</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Analyze/select digital media tools</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Choosing software</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Individual learning modalities</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Content-area knowledge</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Best practices and research findings</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Effective learning environments</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Specification #9. Demonstrate familiarity with a variety of computer-based collaborative tools.

Includes demonstrating knowledge of how to participate in online collaborative environments (e.g., synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated conversations, online bulletin boards, newsgroups, list servers, online chats, and audio/video conferences).
Content specification #9, however, was derived directly from the following Level I specific knowledge and skills of the Technology Standard:

- Each candidate is familiar with a variety of computer-based collaborative tools (e.g., threaded discussion groups, newsgroups, list servers, online chat, and audio/video conferences).
- Each candidate demonstrates an ability to create and maintain effective learning environments using computer-based technology.

The Content Advisory Committee recommended retaining specification #9 as is, agreeing that it was a crucial element in linking technology to education. The committee asserted that, although not presently in common use in the classroom, computer-mediated conversations and collaborative tools are becoming increasingly important to teaching and learning. The significantly higher mean rating given to this specification by teacher educators (3.51) further supports this assertion and the committee's recommendation.

The results of the validation study and the support of the Bias Review Committee have informed the Content Advisory Committee and staff in their recommendation to the Commission to adopt the content specifications for the Preliminary Educational Technology Test provided in Appendix C.

Continued Development and Administration of the Preliminary Educational Technology Test

The Commission's adoption of the content specifications will continue the development of the Preliminary Educational Technology Test. Multiple-choice and constructed-response items are drafted using the content specifications. Both the Bias Review Committee and Content Advisory Committee review and revise as needed all test items prior to a field test of those items. Once these items are field-tested, the Content Advisory Committee will be asked to select marker responses and score the field-tested, constructed-response items.

A notice to the field will also follow the adoption of the content specifications, informing the public of the purpose and availability of the new assessment. A study guide will be developed to assist candidates in preparing to take the new test. Furthermore, information on the new test has been drafted for inclusion in the 2001-2002 SSAT registration bulletin.

The first administration of the Preliminary Educational Technology Test is scheduled for October 2001. Following this test administration, a standard-setting study will be conducted with an independent review panel to develop a recommended passing score. The results of this study will be presented to the Commission for adoption of a passing standard.

Appendix A

Standard 20.5: Use of Computer-Based Technology in the Classroom (Technology Standard)

Candidates are able to use appropriate computer-based technology to facilitate the teaching and learning process.

Rationale

The widespread reliance of contemporary society upon computer-based technologies reflects the increasing importance of electronic information management and communication tools. Technology, in its many forms, has become a powerful tool to enhance curriculum and instruction. Productivity, communication, research, and learning are dramatically enhanced through the appropriate use of technology thereby allowing educators to accomplish tasks that were not previously possible.

The true power and potential of computer-based technologies lies not in the machine itself but in the prudent and appropriate use of software applications to gather, process, and communicate information. Teachers' integration of these tools into the educational experience of students, including those with special needs, is crucial to preparing them for lives of personal, academic, and professional growth and achievement.

Teachers must become fluent, critical users of technology to provide a relevant education and to prepare students to be life-long learners in an information-based, interactive society. The appropriate and efficient use of software applications and related media to access and
evaluate information, analyze and solve problems, and communicate ideas is essential to maximizing the instructional process. Such use of technology supports teaching and learning regardless of individual learning style, socio-economic background, culture, ethnicity, or geographic location.

Level I: Prior to Issuance of the Preliminary Credential

General Knowledge and Skills

- Each candidate demonstrates knowledge of current basic computer hardware and software terminology.
- Each candidate demonstrates competency in the operation and care of computer related hardware (e.g. cleaning input devices, avoiding proximity to magnets, proper startup and shut down sequences, scanning for viruses, and formatting storage media).
- Each candidate implements basic troubleshooting techniques for computer systems and related peripheral devices (e.g. checking the connections, isolating the problem components, distinguishing between software and hardware problems) before accessing the appropriate avenue of technical support.
- Each candidate demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the legal and ethical issues concerned with the use of computer-based technology.
- Each candidate demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the appropriate use of computer-based technology in teaching and learning.

Specific Knowledge and Skills

- Each candidate uses computer applications to manage records (e.g. gradebook, attendance, and assessment records).
- Each candidate uses computers to communicate through printed media (e.g. newsletters incorporating graphics and charts, course descriptions, and student reports).
- Each candidate interacts with others using e-mail.
- Each candidate is familiar with a variety of computer-based collaborative tools (e.g. threaded discussion groups, newsgroups, list servers, online chat, and audio/video conferences).
- Each candidate examines a variety of current educational digital media and uses established selection criteria to evaluate materials, for example, multimedia, Internet resources, telecommunications, computer assisted instruction, and productivity and presentation tools. (See California State guidelines and evaluations).
- Each candidate chooses software for its relevance, effectiveness, alignment with content standards, and value added to student learning.
- Each candidate demonstrates competence in the use of electronic research tools (e.g. access the Internet to search for and retrieve information).
- Each candidate demonstrates the ability to assess the authenticity, reliability, and bias of the data gathered.
- Each candidate identifies student learning styles and determines appropriate technological resources to improve learning.
- Each candidate considers the content to be taught and selects the best technological resources to support, manage, and enhance learning.
- Each candidate demonstrates an ability to create and maintain effective learning environments using computer-based technology.
- Each candidate analyzes best practices and research findings on the use of technology and designs lessons accordingly.
- Each candidate demonstrates knowledge of copyright issues (e.g. distribution of copyrighted materials and proper citing of sources).
- Each candidate demonstrates knowledge of privacy, security, and safety issues (e.g. appropriate use of chatrooms, confidentiality of records including graded student work, publishing names and pictures of minors, and Acceptable Use Policies).
- The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the program.
Level II: Prior to Issuance of the Professional Credential

- Each candidate uses a computer application to manipulate and analyze data (e.g. create, use, and report from a database; and create charts and reports from a spreadsheet).
- Each candidate communicates through a variety of electronic media (e.g. presentations incorporating images and sound, web pages, and portfolios).
- Each candidate interacts and collaborates with others using computer-based collaborative tools (e.g. threaded discussion groups, newsgroups, electronic list management applications, online chat, and audio/video conferences).
- Each candidate demonstrates competence in evaluating the authenticity, reliability, bias of the data gathered; determines outcomes and evaluates the success or effectiveness of the process used.
- Each candidate optimizes lessons based upon the technological resources available in the classroom, school library media centers, computer labs, district and county facilities, and other locations.
- Each candidate designs, adapts, and uses lessons which address the students’ needs to develop information literacy and problem solving skills as tools for lifelong learning.
- Each candidate creates or makes use of learning environments inside the classroom, as well as in library media centers or computer labs, that promote effective use of technology aligned with the curriculum.
- Each candidate uses technology in lessons to increase each student’s ability to plan, locate, evaluate, select, and use information to solve problems and draw conclusions.
- Each candidate uses technology as a tool for assessing student learning and for providing feedback to students and their parents.
- Each candidate frequently monitors and reflects upon the results of using technology in instruction and adapts lessons accordingly.
- Each candidate collaborates with other teachers, mentors, librarians, resource specialists, and other experts to support technology-enhanced curriculum. For example, they may collaborate on interdisciplinary lessons or cross grade level projects.
- Each candidate contributes to site-based planning or local decision making regarding the use of technology and acquisition of technological resources.
- The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the program.

Appendix B

Content Advisory Committee for an Assessment of Preliminary Educational Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otto Benavides</td>
<td>Associate Professor/Director</td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Resource Center, California State University, Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Georgi</td>
<td>Professor and Project Director, PT3 Grant</td>
<td>Department of California State University, Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gibson</td>
<td>Administrator/CIO</td>
<td>Educational Technology and Information Services, Glendale Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Gilkinson</td>
<td>Elementary/Mentor Teacher</td>
<td>Charter Oak Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kala</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Education Media and Computer Services, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Single Subject Assessments for Teaching®

Content Specifications

FIELD 30: PRELIMINARY EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Basic Computer Operations, Concepts, and issues

1  Demonstrate knowledge of current basic computer hardware and software terminology and functions.

   Includes demonstrating knowledge of various kinds of hardware and software and their functions; demonstrating knowledge of basic hardware and software terminology (e.g., peripherals, peripheral connectivity, memory, applications, operating systems, network services); and demonstrating familiarity with the language used to articulate information relating to hardware and software.

2  Understand the basic operation and care of computer-related hardware.

   Includes demonstrating knowledge of proper startup and shutdown sequences and network login procedures; demonstrating knowledge of how to clean input and output devices and care for information storage devices and removable media (e.g., avoiding extreme heat, scratching, and proximity to magnets); demonstrating knowledge about virus scanning, formatting information storage media, opening and closing files, saving files in multiple formats, and using shared files; and demonstrating knowledge of how to replace printer cartridges.

3  Implement basic troubleshooting techniques for computer systems and related peripheral devices.

   Includes recognizing appropriate methods for isolating problems and checking connections; demonstrating knowledge of common printer problems; accessing appropriate technical support; and demonstrating knowledge of how to communicate problems to appropriate technical support staff.

4  Understand the legal and ethical issues associated with the use of computer-based technology.

   Includes understanding and complying with acceptable use policies and laws; demonstrating familiarity with rights and responsibilities regarding Internet and e-mail use as defined in an acceptable use policy; understanding liability issues related to software piracy, plagiarism, and unauthorized access and/or vandalism; recognizing appropriate and inappropriate uses of school-owned resources; demonstrating knowledge of how to comply with copyright law when reproducing and distributing copyrighted materials; and demonstrating knowledge of how to use appropriate source citations.

5  Demonstrate knowledge of privacy, security, and safety issues.
Includes recognizing the importance of maintaining confidentiality of records, including graded student work; demonstrating knowledge of how to protect students from inappropriate information and interactions; recognizing the importance of obtaining proper consent in compliance with local policies for publishing the names and photographs of minors; understanding the appropriate use of chat rooms; and understanding health issues related to the use of computers (e.g., repetitive stress injuries, eye strain, radiation).

Professional Applications of Computer Technology

6 Understand the uses of computer applications for managing records.

Includes demonstrating familiarity with the use of spreadsheet and database applications to collect and organize data such as grades, attendance, and assessment records, and demonstrating knowledge of how to use computers to access and use data collection tools.

7 Understand the use of computers to communicate through printed media.

Includes demonstrating knowledge of how to use word-processing software to create and publish documents (e.g., reports, tests, correspondence, newsletters that incorporate graphics and charts), and demonstrating knowledge of how to produce effective teaching tools using computer applications.

8 Understand the use of e-mail to communicate with others.

Includes identifying the components of e-mail addresses; demonstrating knowledge of how to compose and send e-mail messages within and outside of the school system; and demonstrating knowledge of how to open documents, set up address books, and use attachments.

9 Demonstrate familiarity with a variety of computer-based collaborative tools.

Includes demonstrating knowledge of how to participate in online collaborative environments (e.g., synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated conversations, online bulletin boards, newsgroups, list servers, online chats, and audio/video conferences).

10 Demonstrate competence in the use of electronic research tools.

Includes demonstrating knowledge of how to access the Internet to search for and retrieve information; demonstrating familiarity with the functions of search engines, Web directories, Web browsers, and educational databases (e.g., ERIC); and demonstrating knowledge of how to download, store, and print information.

11 Demonstrate the ability to assess the authenticity, reliability, and bias of data gathered from electronic information sources.

Includes determining the source of information (e.g., academic groups, special interest groups, advertisements); recognizing the purpose of the information presented (e.g., to inform, persuade, entertain); recognizing propaganda techniques (e.g., bandwagon, glittering generality, testimonial); recognizing the importance of verifying primary sources; and recognizing biases contained in information and social biases (based on gender, race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, age, disability, or cultural, economic, or geographic background).

EDUCATIONAL Applications of Computer Technology

12 Understand the appropriate use of computer-based technology in teaching and learning.

Includes demonstrating knowledge of ways to use computer-based technology to facilitate instruction and learning, and demonstrating an understanding of how to design, deliver, and assess student learning activities that integrate computer-based technology.

13 Analyze a variety of educational digital media and use established selection criteria to evaluate materials.

Includes demonstrating familiarity with the characteristics of multimedia, Internet resources, telecommunications, computer-assisted instruction, and productivity and presentation tools, and demonstrating an understanding of criteria against which materials can be evaluated (e.g., alignment with content standards, student needs, ease of use, presentation features, authoring capability, ease of navigation, media
14. **Apply criteria for choosing software for its relevance, effectiveness, alignment with content standards, and value added to student learning.**

Includes demonstrating an understanding of criteria against which educational software can be evaluated (e.g., support of content standards and instructional design, clarity of objectives, scope and scale, quantity of useful information, logical development and organization, appropriate reading and vocabulary levels, identification of bias or distortion of information), and matching software applications to student needs.

15. **Identify student learning modalities and determine appropriate technological resources to facilitate individual learning.**

Includes demonstrating knowledge of how to plan learning activities to include technology resources that are appropriate, based on students' prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic backgrounds; demonstrating familiarity with adaptive techniques and assistive devices for students; and demonstrating knowledge of how to adapt or modify computer-based presentations to meet individual needs.

16. **Demonstrate an understanding of content-area knowledge and select the best technology resources to support, manage, and facilitate learning.**

Includes demonstrating an understanding of how to select technological resources appropriate to content standards, instructional objectives, and grade level and how to manage technological resources in the classroom to keep all students actively engaged.

17. **Demonstrate an understanding of best practices and research findings on the use of technology and design lessons accordingly.**

Includes demonstrating an understanding of the importance of actively engaging in the review of professional research on effective uses of technology; and using research findings to improve instruction.

18. **Demonstrate an ability to create and maintain effective learning environments using computer-based technology.**

Includes demonstrating knowledge of how to design and arrange integration of technology into teaching and learning; demonstrating familiarity with methods for developing and adapting lessons to fit the classroom and the available technology (e.g., one versus multiple computers in the classroom, network versus stand-alone computers); demonstrating knowledge of how to manage computer technology activities along with other classroom activities; and demonstrating knowledge of how to manage learning in virtual environments.